

UNITED STA\..... DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

Washington, D.C. 20231 APPLICATION NUMBER FILING DATE FIRST NAMED APPLICANT ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. 08/305,528 09/13/94 WATANABE EXAMINER 204327 CLAWSON JR.J 25M1/1007 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER EDWARD W. GREASON KENYON & KENYON ONE BROADWAY DATE MALLED: NEW YORK, NY 10004 10/07/96 This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS **OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY** 6-12-96 Responsive to communication(s) filed on _ This action is FINAL. ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire _______ month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). **Disposition of Claims** \boxtimes Claim(s) 21 - 33is/are pending in the application. Of the above, claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. is/are allowed. D Claim(s) <u>99</u> - 33 is/are rejected. Claim(s) __ is/are objected to. ☐ Claims ____ are subject to restriction or election requirement. **Application Papers** ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. __ is/are objected to by the Examiner. The proposed drawing correction, filed on ____ _____is 🗌 approved 🔀 disapproved. ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. $\hfill\Box$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *Certified copies not received: Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Attachment(s) Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413 ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES -

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

Art Unit: 2511

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.
- (g) before the applicant's invention thereof the invention was made in this country by another who had not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed it. In determining priority of invention there shall be considered not only the respective dates of conception and reduction to practice of the invention, but also the reasonable diligence of one who was first to conceive and last to reduce to practice, from a time prior to conception by the other.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (q) of section 102

Art Unit: 2511

of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of potential 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

The Terminal Disclaimer, Paper No. 9, has been approved and thus the double patenting rejection of claims 21-28 is removed.

Claims 29-33 newly submitted are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over either of (Takemae et al. 4,581,720 or 4,740,926) considered with Gupta (4,673,829). These claims apparently specify the very broad and old concept of using word-line boost in a memory array, with a charge pump circuit providing the voltage boost over the supply voltage. However, such boosted word line voltages are old and conventional in the art, as shown by each of the Takemae et al. patents. In `720 note Fig. 3A where the "selected RLi" wordline is signifiantly higher than the power supply Vcc. In `926 note Figs. 2, 4A and 5A which show the same with regard to the wordline.

While neither of the Takemae et al. patents specifically recite the manner by which this boosted voltage is generated, a

-4-

Serial Number: 305,528

Art Unit: 2511

charge pump is understood by not only any person skilled in the art but also by one of ordinary skill in the art. However, to make things perfectly clear to someone who may be unfamiliar with the technology, Gupta is cited. Here is disclosed the conventional manner of generating such boosted wordline voltages above the supply voltage, namely a charge pump. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use such a charge pump of Gupta in either of the Takemae et al. patents as an onboard charge pump is small, efficient, eliminates the need for an additional power supply and feed, as is the conventional way such wordline boost voltages are generated.

The Letter to the Draftsman has NOT been approved because the changes have not been indicated in read as is required.

Applicant's arguments filed June 10, 1996 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Art Unit: 2511

This action is a **final rejection** and is intended to close the prosecution of this application. Applicant's response to this action is limited either to an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or to an amendment complying with the requirements set forth below.

If applicant should desire to appeal any rejection made by the examiner, a Notice of Appeal must be filed within the period for response identifying the rejected claim or claims appealed. The Notice of Appeal must be accompanied by the required appeal fee of \$ appropriate amount.

If applicant should desire to file an amendment, entry of a proposed amendment after final rejection cannot be made as a matter of right unless it merely cancels claims or complies with a formal requirement made earlier. Amendments touching the merits of the application which otherwise might not be proper may be admitted upon a showing a good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and why they were not presented earlier.

The filing of an amendment after final rejection, whether or not it is entered, does not stop the running of the statutory period for response to the final rejection unless the examiner holds the claims to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, if a Notice of Appeal has not been filed properly within the period for response or any extension of this period obtained

-6-

Art Unit: 2511

under either 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) or (b), the application will become abandoned.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph Clawson at telephone number (703) 308-0956.

Clawson/tj

Sept. 11, 1996

JOSEPH E. CLAWSON, JR.